

Application No. 10/524,670
Reply to Office Action of July 18, 2006

IN THE DRAWINGS

The attached sheet of drawings includes changes to Fig. 9. This sheet, which includes Fig. 9, replaces the original sheet including Fig. 9.

Attachment: Replacement Sheet

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, as presently amended and in light of the following discussion, is respectfully requested.

The drawings have been objected to as not being in compliance with U.S. patent practice and procedure; Claims 1, 3 and 4 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Yang et al. (GB Patent Application No. 235221) in view of Aulanko et al.; Claims 5 and 6 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Yang et al. in view of Aulanko et al. and further in view of Hashiguchi et al.; Claims 2-4 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Yang et al. in view of Boll and Aulanko et al. and Claims 5 and 6 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Yang et al. in view of Boll and Aulanko et al. and further in view of Hashiguchi et al.. Claims 1-6 have been canceled, without prejudice while new claims 7-10 have been added and thus, Claims 7-10 remain active.

Considering first then the Examiner's objection to the drawing, it is to be noted that Claims 5 and 6 have been canceled, without prejudice and the new claims make no mention of the exit door referred to by the Examiner.

Next considering then the rejection of Claims 1, 3 and 4 under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Yang et al. in view of Aulanko et al., the rejection of Claims 5 and 6 under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Yang et al. in view of Aulanko et al. and Hashiguchi et al., the rejection of Claims 2-4 under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Yang et al. in view of Boll and Aulanko et al. and the rejection of claims 5 and 6 under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Yang et al. in view of Boll and Aulanko et al. and Hashiguchi et al., it is to be noted that each of Claims 1-6 have now been canceled in favor of new Claims 7-10. In this regard, it is noted that new Claim 7 finds bases for the limitations set forth therein, for example, in the description of the second embodiment illustrated in

Application No. 10/524,670
Reply to Office Action of July 18, 2006


Figures 4-6; Claim 8 finds support in the third embodiment shown in Figures 7-9, for example; Claim 9 corresponds, for example, to the second and third embodiments; and new Claim 10 corresponds to originally filed Claim 3. Insofar as a review of the prior art of record fails to indicate a teaching or disclosure of the combined limitations of Claims 7-10, Applicants submit that such claims merit indication of allowability with the same being hereby earnestly solicited.

Applicants note that a substitute Figure 9 is submitted herewith for the purpose of properly labeling members 20a and 20b so as to correct the double recitation of reference number 20a in Figure 9. It is therefore submitted that such merits entry and the same is hereby respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, an early and favorable Office Action is believed to be in order and the same is hereby respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Gregory J. Maier

Registration No. 25,599



James D. Hamilton
Registration No. 28,421
Attorneys of Record

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 03/06)
JDH/rac